

DRAFT
Solid Waste Staff Work Group Meeting Notes
September 15, 2004
Tukwila Community Center

Meeting Attendees:

City Staff:

Alison Bennett – City of Bellevue
Bill Brandon – Snoqualmie Valley Cities
Elaine Borjeson – City of Kirkland
Rika Cecil – City of Shoreline
Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn
Frank Iriarte – City of Tukwila
Linda Knight – City of Renton
Nina Rivkin – City of Redmond
Rob VanOrsow – City of Federal Way

County Staff:

Theresa Jennings
Kevin Kiernan
Jane Gateley
Diane Yates
Peggy Dorothy
Dave White

Introductions

Theresa Jennings began the meeting by introducing Dave White and discussing the Division's team for working on the waste export system plan.

Dave White is currently a Budget/Finance Officer with the Department of Natural Resources. He is also currently serving as the Acting Finance Manager for the Parks Division (the new Finance Manager arrives the first week of October). Dave comes to the Division with a wealth of programmatic experience. He was a major contributor to the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan and he led the development of the Intermodal Business Case and the 2003 Solid Waste Business Plan. He has also had programmatic experience in other positions including watershed planning and air quality. As a consultant he worked as a project manager/facilitator of a federal advisory committee on federal clean water act legislation and other collaborative processes.

Transfer Station LOS Standards and Criteria

The Division will edit the LOS Standards and Criteria Table based on today's discussion and comments from the haulers. The revised table will be incorporated into the report, which will include an introduction and discussion of process.

Since the county council will be working on the 2005 budget when the report is transmitted on October 15th, it won't be considered by council until December. The Regional Policy Committee meets on October 6th and then December 1st. The Division will provide the RPC with a project status at its meeting on the 6th. The

Natural Resources and Utilities Committee is not meeting again this year until December 2nd.

In response to a question, Kevin Kiernan said that the “Source” column in the table refers to where the Criteria comes from and whether the criteria will be a policy recommendation or is already in county code.

Kiernan went over adopted ordinance 14971 reporting requirements, which include a report on transfer system level of service standards and criteria *‘that provide objective measures for when a transfer station needs to be upgraded in place, relocated to a more appropriate location, or additional transfer stations need to be built.’*

The Standards and Criteria fall into three general categories:

1. Level of Service to Users
2. Station Characteristics
3. Local and Regional Effects of Facility

Standards that cross all three areas are queue and wait times:

- Users see queuing as amount of time waiting to get into facility.
- For station, it’s a question of how to deal with queue on site.
- If queue extends onto public streets, then it falls into 3rd category.

There’s also a cost and rate impact.

The Division proposes that a number of the criteria that address the same issues be condensed, such as criteria relating to traffic.

Level of Service to Users:

- *Maximum travel time to a transfer facility:* There are three types of users: commercial haulers, residential self haulers and business self haulers. There’s no difference in travel time for the three types of users. Waste Management would like no more than 30 minute maximum travel time. The Division is working with county GIS staff on a map that will show travel time and distance and can be used to determine maximum travel times. The Division is using its data about where people are coming from at each station in development of the map. The Division is also conducting its biannual customer survey. Survey results will be incorporated into the map.
- *Queue time:* Measures wait time to get in and out of the station minus unload time. Unload time is within the customers’ control.

The comment was made that while a facility may be large enough to handle the traffic and tonnage, a reduction in staffing could impact queuing.

Language will be added to the Comment section of the table that adequate staffing levels are assumed.

There was discussion about adding language to address exceptional circumstances, such as windstorms.

The subcommittee discussed whether commercial haulers should receive a higher level of service than self haulers. There's an economic impact to the haulers for longer wait times. Commercial haulers are charge customers. They serve many customers, bring in larger loads than self haulers and know how to get through the facility quickly.

The comment was made that since self haulers use the stations infrequently, a little longer wait time for them but may not be a significant issue.

Commercial haulers can get through station in average time of 16 minutes while residential self haulers take about 30 minutes and business self haulers take about 20 minutes. The standard is a maximum.

While excessive queue times may impact customers on site, station traffic may be contained on site and not overflow onto city streets. That would not necessarily trigger a decision to upgrade, relocate or build a new station.

Also, it could take a wait of 30 minutes or more at the Renton Transfer Station before the queue spills onto city streets, while at Algona it would only take a wait time of 15 minutes before city streets are impacted.

The Division will look at its current data to see what wait times are currently.

- *Maximum transaction time and Minimum hours of operation*
The Division recommends removing these since they would not trigger the need for a new station. Maximum transaction time may trigger the need for new phone lines to handle credit/debit cards. The minimum hours are set in county code and can be increased if need dictates. Hours are a mitigation tool, not really a criterion.
- *Recycling services:* This is about whether services meet current recycling policies and will be reflected with a 'yes' or 'no' answer.

Discussion followed about whether recycling services should be made as convenient as possible, if the same services need to be offered at every station and if the lack of any or enough recycling services at transfer stations would trigger the need to build a new station for \$40 million.

There are waste reduction/recycling policies in the current adopted Comp Plan. If changes to those policies are desired, that can feed into the update process for the next Comp Plan.

Station Capacity and Characteristics:

This group is split into two identical parts, which are in relation to space needs. One part addresses current space needs; the second addresses future space needs.

Current Needs:

- *Vehicle Capacity:* Number of vehicles a station can accommodate per day within available queuing on site.
- *Sufficient Tipping Stalls:* Measures vehicle capacity.
- *Emergency Storage:* Standard is three days storage and is based on past experience with wind/snow storms and information on how long a rail line may be down.

Adequate onsite trailer parking would provide for enough trailers to move all garbage out within 24 hours. Garbage comes in in peaks and valley. Trailers are used onsite to take peaks off. Number of onsite trailers needed at Bow Lake is smaller than at other stations because the pit can be used as backup storage.

- *Space for Standard Employee Amenities and Space for Public Amenities:* Currently sufficient
- *Space for Expansion:* Overlaps some of the other evaluation criteria. Will move this to Future Needs section.

Additional Characteristics:

No comments on the following items.

- Ability to accommodate more queuing
- Ability to screen waste
- Minimum roof clearance
- Environmental nuisance
- Public and employee safety
- Ability to accommodate waste export
- Structural integrity
- Power backup for emergencies
- Meets ADA

Local and Regional Effects of Facility:

- *Regional Equity:* Refers not only to a host city's fair share of regional solid waste tonnage and vehicles, but also of other public facilities.

Discussion followed about how a decision would be made based on regional equity. There could be a situation where a station met all the LOS standards, but the host community wanted the station to close.

The group discussed land use compatibility with surrounding development. A surrounding land use could change making the station incompatible with the growth. The standard would have to be pinpointed at a point in time. The cities will consider this standard and submit comments to the Division.

- *Noise*: No comments
- *Odors*: No comments
- *Meets Standards for Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts*: No comments
- *Adequate Buffer*: Standard is 100 feet, excluding mitigation measures. In other words, a noise wall does not have to be 100 feet from the property line. The buffer would have to be preserved onsite in order to account for encroachment by development around the facility.
- *Acceptable Traffic Impacts on Local Streets*: Level of Service Standards for traffic is widely accepted standard. Under state law, the county can pay mitigation to host cities for road impacts. Road wear and tear would be addressed through mitigation.
- *Aesthetics*: Screening the facility from the surrounding neighborhood and also making sure the facility isn't allowed to deteriorate.

Cost and Rate Impacts:

- *Capital Costs of New Facility vs. Upgrade of Existing*:

Comment was made that there may be a step before having to look at capital costs for a new or upgraded facility. Other operational costs could be factored in to mitigate the need for a new or upgraded facility. So, system efficiencies or improvements could be looked at first.

- *Rate Impacts*: Cities to provide input.
- *System Costs*: Cities to provide input.

The next draft of the Table will be numbered for easy reference. It will be sent out to the large group by Friday, September 24th. The large group will meet on Wednesday, September 29th to review the draft report before it is finalized and sent to council. The technical subcommittee will meet next Wednesday, September 22nd to review the revised table.

Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee

The report on the form, structure and responsibilities of the MSWMAC is due to council by the end of the year. The group decided to form a subcommittee to complete this work and then work on the governance issues. The group decided that King County staff should participate on the subcommittee.